

COBBETT'S WEEKLY REGISTER.

VOL. 43.—No. 4.] LONDON, SATURDAY, JULY 27, 1822. [Price 6d.

Published every Saturday Morning, at Six o'Clock.

TO
THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND.

THE BISHOP AND THE SOLDIER.

"Ye shall not respect persons in judgment; but ye shall hear the small as well as the great; ye shall not be afraid of the face of man; for the judgment is God's."

DEUTERONOMY, Chap. I. V. 17.

Kensington, 24 July 1822.

COUNTRYMEN,

ON the above subject you will find, at the end of this Address, some articles, first published in *The Statesman Newspaper*. The object of the present Address is, to call your attention to the subject of the *Administration of Justice*, which, at this moment, is of all others, the subject most interesting to us.

Justice, as applied to the decisions of courts, as applied to laws, and the execution of the laws, means *impartiality* in what is

done. The law may be very *lenient* or very *severe*, and equally *just* in both cases. The laws of England which hang men for murder, and those of Pennsylvania which imprison murderers for life, have no difference in point of *justice*. But, if the laws of any country, hanged men, in one situation of life, for murder, and punished men, in another situation of life, with transportation, or something short of death, those laws would be *unjust*, and would, in fact, be acts of tyranny so outrageous as to justify, and fully justify, the use of effectual means to overthrow the Government that had made such laws.

No country that I know of, except the *slave-countries*, have ever been disgraced and cursed by laws of this description. In those horrid countries (Virginia, for instance), it was, until of late years, *not murder to kill a black*, which was punished with a *fine* of about fifty pounds sterling. Now, the law makes it murder; but, to the shame of America, to the shame

G

Printed and published by C. CLEMENT, No. 163, Fleet Street.

of *Republican Government*, this murder is frequently committed, in all the Slave States; but, I believe, no man can produce an instance of a *white murderer* having been *punished as a murderer*!

This is that abuse in the administration of justice; that base partiality; that perverting of judgment, against which the Bible, in more than two hundred places, cautions man, and against the doing of which it utters such horrible denunciations. An *impartial* administration of the laws is the very foundation of civil society, into which men *could not* have entered without a compact, necessarily implied, that such impartiality should always take place. Courts and Judges are venerated, and held in the highest respect, because their decisions, which have so much effect upon the affairs of men, are looked upon as being *just*; as being, in all respects perfect, as far as any thing human can pretend to perfection. The Courts of Justice are the last resort of the oppressed. Riches, and the power inseparable from riches, would make the poor man even more degraded than the beast, could he not rely on justice from the laws. This is that

equality of which men speak, as being so desirable a thing to secure by political institutions; an impartial, an equal, an even-handed administration of the laws; for, where this is wanting, to talk of liberty or property is an abuse of words and a mockery upon the community. Indeed there is no *community*; for, community means a right *in common* to be treated in a certain manner by the laws; and where the treatment is not *common to all*, there is, in fact no community: it is a herd of slaves governed by a tyranny.

In the way of preface to what I have to say upon the subject stated at the head of this paper, I have been led into these general observations, not by any suspicion that any thing has been or will be, attempted by persons in power, to screen the parties, or, rather, the principal party, implicated in this horrid transaction; not by any suspicion of this sort have I been led to make these observations, but by the conduct of that infamous part of the Press, of which I have so long been the accuser, which has so long been the instrument of every thing that is base and corrupt, and which, under the epithet "*respectable*," has been distinguished, by the enemies of

our freedom and happiness, from that part of the press which has been the constant advocate of freedom and of morals.

This part of the Press; this "respectable" part of the press, which was so loud, so vehement, in the case of the *poor* miscreants of *Vere-street*, has now been either silent (as the *Old Times*,) or, has been hatching apologies, as in the case of the *New Times*. In this way, this "respectable" part of the press has been at work to pave the way, if possible, for that, which to suppose possible, would be an offence that would bring down on the supposer the severest punishment. The design of this part of the press manifestly has been to smother the whole transaction if possible; and, if that were not possible, to provide, if possible, impunity for the offender; than which design, there never was, perhaps, in the world, any thing equal in point of turpitude. I have long denounced this press as the deluder of the people; as the foe of freedom and of justice; as the promoter of vice, of rigour, and of cruelty; and now it stands, before this abused nation, proved guilty of all the charges that I ever brought against it. In the weekly paper, the *Observer*, which has acted an honest part upon

this occasion, I first saw an account of the transaction on Sunday morning. "Now," said I, "we shall see how this Sunday has been employed." I then sent for the *John Bull*, and found that John was not to be had so early as the other papers; because the printing of him had been delayed by an *accident*, which had happened to his *machinery*! I wanted nothing more to convince me that the work was carrying on with a heavy hand; and that it was necessary for me to be in London early the next morning to see the extent of the effect of that work, which extent, however, I pretty well guessed at the moment I heard of the accident in *John Bull's machinery*. By about six o'clock I had the fruits of the whole of the "respectable" part of the press of that morning before me; and in about six hours after that, I had exhibited it for the inspection of the public.

In order to form an adequate idea of the baseness of this "respectable" part of the press, we must consider, First, The situation in life of the principal party; Second, What had been stated as the result of his detection; and Third, How this results squares with the bail and other things demanded and enforced upon certain

other occasions. When we have taken a view of all these, and seen what a case it forms all taken together; and when we have again reflected, that this "*respectable*" and base press, either passed the thing over in total silence, or, so disguised, and so mutilated the matter, so cautiously spoke of it; so studiously crammed the few words into an obscure corner; when we have done all this, we shall, and not till then, be able to form something of an idea of the baseness of this "*respectable*" London Press, the equal of which, I am happy to believe, does not exist in the whole world.

The principal person concerned in the horrid transaction, is a *Bishop of the Church of England*, and as such announced from the beginning. We know well, that, to publish any thing tending to excite hatred or contempt of the body of Bishops would expose any man to the severest punishment. There is at this time, I believe, a prosecution pending in the Court of King's Bench, in consequence of a criminal information moved for by Lawyer Scarlett, against a printer in the North, who had published something *reflecting on the Clergy of the county of Durham*. Not on any particular clergyman; but

on the Clergy of the County in general, there being no particular plaintiff or complainant. You will observe, that the Judges granted the *criminal information*. They did not refer the matter to a Grand Jury. So that this is a body of men entitled to *peculiar protection*; for, it is hardly to be believed, that a criminal information would have been obtained against a man for publishing a censure on the *Miners* of Durham, the *Weavers* of Lancashire, or the *Farmers* of Norfolk. Yet, it is very difficult to say why either of these classes should not be entitled to the same protection as the *Parsons*.

Never mind, however; let that go. The person principally concerned is a Bishop of the Church of England; a Right Reverend *Father in God*. He is, too, of what is called *noble birth*. The pedigree of his family, as published in the peerage, says that he is descended from a noble family of Normandy; that his ancestor came over to England in the reign of Edward the Confessor; that this ancestor returned to France, and came over again in company with William that they call the Conqueror; and had divers English lands and estates bestowed upon him. Thus, then,

here was a great personage, indeed :—Here was one of the old hack Burke's "*Corinthian Pillars of polished society*;" here was that to begin with. Next came the *Clergyman of the Church of England*; next came the Bishop, and a Bishop not of yesterday, I assure you. He appears to have been born about fifty-six or fifty-seven years ago, and he has been a Bishop fifteen years. After being a Bishop for nearly the whole of this time, he was promoted, that is to say, raised, a little while ago, from the rich Bishopric of Ferns to the richer Bishopric of Clogher.

In the course of these fifteen years what are the duties that he has not had to perform; and how great have been the powers that he possessed! If it be true, and true it is, because told us by unerring wisdom, that, where much is given much is required, how much was there required at the hands of this man! The income of his Bishopric has been stated at *thirteen thousand pounds a-year*. But, besides this, let us consider, what is the nature of his engagement on becoming a Bishop. This is of the utmost importance in the present case; and, though most of us know that the engagement is of a most se-

rious and even awful nature, still we can hardly have an idea, from mere recollection, how solemn, sacred, and awful, it really is. This being the case, I shall here insert, from the Book of Common Prayer, a part of what takes place at the consecration of a Bishop; and which must, of necessity, have taken place at the consecration of this very person.

Every thing being prepared, the Archbishop, who is to perform the office of Consecration, is to begin the Communion service, in which the following is to be the Collect:

" Almighty God, who by thy
 " Son Jesus Christ didst give to
 " thy holy Apostles many excel-
 " lent gifts, and didst charge
 " them to feed thy flock; Give
 " grace, we beseech thee, that
 " they may diligently preach thy
 " Word, and duly administer the
 " godly discipline thereof; and
 " grant to the people, that they
 " may obediently follow the same;
 " that all may receive the crown
 " of everlasting glory; through
 " Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Then comes the reading of the following passage from the first of Timothy, chapter the third, verse the first:

" This is a true saying, If a

" man desire the office of a
 " Bishop, he desireth a good
 " work. A Bishop then must be
 " blameless, the husband of one
 " wife, vigilant, sober, of good
 " behaviour, given to hospitality,
 " apt to teach; not given to wine,
 " no striker, not greedy of filthy
 " lucre; but patient, not a brawler,
 " not covetous; one that ruleth
 " well his own house, having his
 " children in subjection with all
 " gravity; (for if a man know not
 " how to rule his own house, how
 " shall he take care of the Church
 " of God?) Not a novice, lest
 " being lifted up with pride he
 " fall into the condemnation of
 " the devil. Moreover he must
 " have a good report of them
 " which are without; lest he fall
 " into reproach and the snare of
 " the devil."

After this, at some distance on,
 comes the reading of the follow-
 ing passage from Saint Mat-
 thew, chapter twenty-eight, verse
 eighteen:

" Jesus came and spake unto
 " them, saying, All power is given
 " unto me in heaven and in
 " earth. Go ye therefore, and
 " teach all nations, baptizing
 " them in the name of the Father,
 " and of the Son, and of the
 " Holy Ghost: teaching them to

" observe all things whatsoever
 " I have commanded you: and,
 " lo, I am with you alway, even
 " unto the end of the world."

When the ceremony has pro-
 ceeded thus far, the person to be
 made a bishop is presented to the
 Archbishop sitting in his chair
 near the Holy Table; the Bi-
 shops who present him saying,

" Most Reverend Father in
 " God, we present unto you this
 " godly and well-learned man to
 " be ordained and consecrated
 " Bishop."

The oath of allegiance and su-
 premacy is then administered to
 him, and also an oath of obe-
 dience to the Archbishop. Then
 the Archbishop, in the following
 words, moves the congregation to
 pray,

" Brethren, it is written in the
 " Gospel of Saint Luke, That our
 " Saviour Christ continued the
 " whole night in prayer, before
 " he did choose and send forth
 " his twelve Apostles. It is
 " written also in the Acts of the
 " Apostles, that the Disciples who
 " were at Antioch did fast and
 " pray, before they laid hands on
 " Paul and Barnabas, and sent
 " them forth. Let us therefore,
 " following the example of our

“ Saviour Christ, and his Apostles,
 “ first fall to prayer, before we
 “ admit, and send forth this per-
 “ son presented unto us, to the
 “ work whereunto we trust the
 “ Holy Ghost hath called him.”

Then follows the Litany with
 the following passage in it :

“ That it may please thee to
 “ bless this our Brother elected,
 “ and to send thy grace upon him,
 “ that he may duly execute the
 “ office whereunto he is called, to
 “ the edifying of thy church, and
 “ to the honour, praise, and glory
 “ of thy name.”

This being done, and another
 prayer having been said, the fol-
 lowing questions and answers take
 place between the Archbishop
 and the newly elected Bishop, to
 which questions and answers, I
 beg my readers to pay particular
 attention :

“ *Archbishop.*—Brother, foras-
 “ much as the Holy Scripture and
 “ the ancient Canons command,
 “ that we should not be hasty in
 “ laying on hands, and admitting
 “ any person to Government in
 “ the Church of Christ, which he
 “ hath purchased with no less
 “ price than the effusion of his
 “ own blood ; before I admit you
 “ to this Administration, I will

“ examine you in certain articles,
 “ to the end that the Congrega-
 “ tion present may have a trial,
 “ and bear witness, how you be
 “ minded to behave yourself in
 “ the Church of God.—Are you
 “ persuaded that you be truly
 “ called to this Ministration, ac-
 “ cording to the will of our Lord
 “ Jesus Christ, and the order of
 “ this realm ?”

“ *Answer.*—I am so persuaded.”

“ *Archbishop.*—Are you per-
 “ suaded that the Holy Scriptures
 “ contain sufficiently all doctrine
 “ required of necessity for eternal
 “ salvation through faith in Jesus
 “ Christ ? And are you deter-
 “ mined out of the same Holy
 “ Scriptures to instruct the people
 “ committed to your charge ; and
 “ to teach or maintain nothing as
 “ required of necessity to eternal
 “ salvation, but that which you
 “ shall be persuaded may be con-
 “ cluded and proved by the same ?”

“ *Answer.*—I am so persuaded
 “ and determined by God’s Grace.”

“ *Archbishop.*—Will you then
 “ faithfully exercise yourself in
 “ the same Holy Scriptures, and
 “ call upon God by prayer, for
 “ the true understanding of the
 “ same ; so as you may be able
 by them to teach and exhort

"with wholesome doctrine, and
"to withstand and convince the
"gainsayers?"

"*Answer.*—I will so do, by the
"help of God."

"*Archbishop.*—Are you ready,
"with all faithful diligence, to
"banish and drive away all er-
"roneous and strange doctrine,
"contrary to God's word; and
"both privately and openly to
"call upon and encourage others
"to the same?"

"*Answer.*—I am ready, the
"Lord being my helper."

"*Archbishop.*—Will you deny
"all ungodliness and worldly lust,
"and live soberly, righteously,
"and godlily, in this present world;
"that you may show yourself in
"all things an example of good
"works unto others, that the ad-
"versary may be ashamed, hav-
"ing nothing to say against you?"

"*Answer.*—I will so do, the
"Lord being my helper."

"*Archbishop.*—Will you main-
"tain and set forward, as much
"as shall lie in you, quietness,
"love, and peace among men;
"and such as be unquiet, dis-
"obedient, and criminous, within
"your diocese, correct and pu-
"nish, according to such autho-

"rity as you have by God's word,
"and as to you shall be committed
"by the ordinance of this
"Realm?"

"*Answer.*—I will so do, by the
"help of God."

"*Archbishop.*—Will you be
"faithful in ordaining, sending, or
"laying hands upon others?"

"*Answer.*—I will so be, by the
"help of God."

"*Archbishop.*—Will you shew
"yourself gentle, and be merciful
"for Christ's sake, to poor and
"needy people, and to all stran-
"gers destitute of help?"

"*Answer.*—I will so shew my-
"self, by God's help."

Then the Archbishop, standing
up, says, "Almighty God, our
"Heavenly Father, who hath
"given you a good will to do all
"these things, Grant also unto
"you strength and power to per-
"form the same; that, he accom-
"plishing in you the good work
"which he hath begun, you may
"be found perfect and irrepre-
"hensible at the latter day;
"through Jesus Christ our Lord.
"Amen."

Then the Archbishop and Bi-
shops present lay their hands
upon the head of the elected

Bishop, kneeling before them upon his knees, the Archbishop, saying,

“ *Receive the Holy Ghost*, for
“ the office and work of a Bishop
“ in the Church of God, now com-
“ mitted unto thee by the imposi-
“ tion of our hands; in the name
“ of the Father, and of the Son,
“ and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.
“ And remember that thou *stir up*
“ *the grace of God which is given*
“ *thee by this imposition of our*
“ *hands*: for God hath not given
“ us the spirit of fear, but of
“ power, and love and sober-
“ ness.”

Then the Archbishop delivers him the Bible, saying,

“ Give heed unto reading, ex-
“ hortation, and doctrine. Think
“ upon the things contained in
“ this book. Be diligent in them,
“ that the increase coming thereby
“ may be manifest unto all men.
“ Take heed unto thyself and to
“ doctrine, and be diligent in do-
“ ing them: for by so doing thou
“ shalt both save thyself and them
“ that hear thee. Be to the flock
“ of Christ a shepherd, not a
“ wolf; feed them, devour them
“ not. Hold up the weak, heal
“ the sick, bind up the broken,
“ bring again the outcasts, seek

“ the lost. Be so merciful, that
“ you be not too remiss; so mi-
“ nister discipline, that you forget
“ not mercy: that when the chief
“ Shepherd shall appear, you
“ may receive the never-fading
“ crown of glory; through Jesus
“ Christ our Lord. Amen.”

Now mind, here was a solemn declaration, made before God at the altar, that he believed himself called by the Spirit of God; and here was a solemn receiving of the *Holy Ghost*! To dwell upon such a thing would be useless, and worse than useless, because it would be an insult to the moral feelings of the reader. I beg the reader, however, to think of the punishment that has been inflicted upon Mr. Carlile and his wife and sister for expressing their opinions, hostile to that religion, of which the above cited is one of the ceremonies.

Besides his office of Bishop, he is one of the “ *Commissioners of the Board of Education in Ireland.*” Here was another great duty taken upon himself. One can hardly contemplate with a steady eye, the magnitude of these two offices; and when we consider the enormous worldly gains attending them; the great riches; the power; the splendour;

all the endless advantages appertaining to his rank and dignity, how much has been given here can we easily say; and, shall he give the Scriptures the lie and say that much ought not to have been expected? Shall we say that the act ought to have been disguised; and that, because wealth and honours had been bestowed on the party with such profusion, his offence should have been dealt with, in a manner in which it has been dealt with by the "respectable" and infamous press, while that same press, had he been a tradesman, artisan, or labourer, would have blazoned forth the name and the act, day after day, as it has done upon so many occasions when the offence has been of a comparatively insignificant nature?

We now come to what has been stated in the newspapers as the result of this transaction. It is said that the offender was held to bail, two tradesmen being his sureties, and he being suffered to go at large, upon their giving bail to the amount of five hundred pounds each; and that the soldier, for want of bail, was committed to take his trial! Time will show us how this matter stands. In the meanwhile, the newspapers tell us, that Mr. Dyer,

the Magistrate, upon the representation of Mr. Alley, found himself obliged to admit the Bishop to bail. I do not know how Mr. Dyer could be obliged to do this; and that, too, without any remanding; without any re-examination; without any of that time for deliberation, which has been taken in so many other cases. Mr. John Knight of Manchester and others were not admitted to bail. They were, indeed, charged with High Treason; but when they came to trial, they were tried for misdemeanor; but had never been admitted to bail.

Another observation is, that surely the Soldier might have found bail proportionate to that of the Bishop. The Bishop's bail was only to a *thirteenth part* of the amount of his annual income. Now, a thirteenth part of the Soldier's income would have been twenty-eight shillings; and could not the Soldier get two men to be bound for him in a bail bond of fourteen shillings a-piece? It must be a forlorn dog indeed that could not have mustered up the twenty-eight shillings to lodge with the Justice in the way of surety. The law says, indeed, that excessive bail shall not be demanded; but, if this were the proper bail for a Bishop, what

was my bail, after having been sentenced to pass two years with fellows from whose society I redeemed myself by paying upwards of *twelve hundred pounds*, for the bare use of private rooms in the gaol; after paying a thousand pounds fine to the King, and all this for having expressed my indignation at the flogging of English Militia-men under a guard of German Bayonets; if the Bishop's bail was a proper one, what was my bail of *three thousand* pounds myself, with two sureties of a thousand pounds each, to keep the peace and be of good behaviour for *seven years* after the expiration of the two years that I was sentenced to pass amongst felons! And what is the bail of Mr. Carlile? The precise amount of the bail I do not know; but I know that it is *for life*, at the end of his *three years* of imprisonment. I know that there is heavy bail also in the case of his sister, and I know that their fines altogether amount to fifteen hundred pounds, just one-third part more than the bail taken of the Bishop. Joseph Swann was sentenced by the Magistrates of Cheshire, from one and the same Quarter Sessions, under three indictments for what are called Libel and Sedition to an imprisonment for **FOUR**

YEARS AND A HALF, leaving a wife and four small children who had never been paupers before to become paupers or to perish. Besides this, he was a long time in prison before *for the want of bail*. What bail was demanded of him I do not know; but in all human probability, not less than a tenth part, at least, of that which was taken of the Bishop, though his income could not have been a five hundredth part of that of the Bishop.

These are the things that we ought to treasure up in our minds. John Hayes of Boulton, whose crime was going round the town of Boulton to inform his townsmen that their countryman William Cobbett had arrived at Liverpool in good health, was sent to gaol for ten weeks, because he did not find bail. What bail was demanded of him I know not. It could hardly have been less than a tenth part of what was taken from the Bishop; and at the end of the ten weeks John Hays was never brought to trial at all.

The newspapers may have been misinformed about the thousand pound bail taken from the Bishop. Mr. Dyer may have taken fifty thousand pounds bail for any thing that I know to the contrary, and "*two Tradesmen*" may not have

been the sureties; but, at any rate, this is what has been announced to the public; and that public I conjure to be upon the *constant watch* to see the termination of this affair. My readers may be well assured that this attempt on the part of the "*respectable*" and infamous part of the press will be attended with consequences very different from that, expected by those who have been at work with that press, which has now, however, fixed its character for ever, and blasted itself for ever, with every honest man in the world. Do they think they can hide this matter under a blanket? The thing is already gone, not only to the utmost corners of this country; but, is already in France, and in more than one ship to carry it to America. In the latter country every eye will be directed to the winding up of this drama. There the press will disguise nothing. It will tell all, and men will openly and freely express what they think of every one concerned in the transaction from the first to the last.

Though noticed elsewhere in this same Register, I cannot refrain from again adverting to the baseness of the morning Papers in totally suppressing the speech

of Sir William de Crespigny in the House of Commons, on Monday night, when he noticed this affair, and observed that the public was greatly indebted to the Statesman newspaper for the impartiality that it had shown. Nothing shows so strongly as this the lengths to which the "*respectable*" and corrupt press is capable of going. There is room for shuffle, at any rate, with regard to the other parts of its conduct. The Editors may say that they were blind, that they were drunk, that they were "*insane*" as the old Doctors' Commons Doctor of the New Times says of the Bishop. They may say that it was an unfortunate time of the moon; and that, as the Bishop *must* have been mad, so they might well have been mad too, being persons not by any means fortified in a manner equal to the Bishop. But, here is the devil to do, in the case of Sir Wm. de Crespigny's speech; for here are *all of their reporters*, not much less than *fifty in number*. They could not all be deaf, drunk, or mad. We should soon have the Penitentiaries and Bedlam full, at this rate. Here are fifty men, with pen in hand and books open before them, and not a word do they put down of Sir William de

Crespigny's speech. The *generous Collyer* would, perhaps, "*take the whole upon himself*," as far as related to the *Old Times*; but there were five or six other papers; and, in short, the fact is clear enough, when they got home to their several news-offices, that part of their report was expunged, by those who knew, not only the *value* of words, but also the value of blank spaces where words ought to be.

I take my leave of this affair for the present, with once more requesting the people in every part of the country to be upon the *watch*; for, this is a matter that will never die as long as the system shall live. We have had outcry enough about Jacobins and Radicals, and about Sedition and Blasphemy. We have had bel-lowings enough from the *Old Times* newspaper against the courageous women who have maintained their opinions with ruin and prisons and torture before their eyes. We now have this newspaper, in its true colours and character, and all those whom it has persecuted are beginning to take their just vengeance on it.

The very greatest of all the evils that have ever afflicted the country has been this corrupt press. Those who praised the

nefarious thing during the season of *Six-Acts* knew well its various uses. The crafty Scotch Lawyer; that smooth, that soft spoken, that canting, that humanity gentleman, knew well the uses of this mercenary machine, when he called it respectable and contrasted it with that which he was so anxious to destroy; when he was praising to the skies one of the old battered hacks of Corruption, and pointing out for bloody vengeance him whom he knew could not be corrupted. Let him now take the respectable part of the press to his bosom. Let him take it as his own breed and seed; for he is really one of the fathers of it. And let us quit the thing for the present, with a resolution to return to it again, till it become as notorious as its infamous twin brother; which is as notorious as the Sun at noon-day.

WM. COBBETT.

THE THING,

AND

THE INFAMOUS NEWSPAPERS:
THE BISHOP AND THE SOLDIER.

Reprinted from "THE STATES-
MAN" of Monday.

OUR readers have often had to oblige us by their attention to

what we have said of the blessed **THING**. We are now going to trouble them upon an extraordinary occasion indeed, and are going to give an instance of the baseness and infamy of the London newspapers, such as we never before had it in our power to give; and such as we are quite sure will, before we have done with it, implant the character of everlasting infamy upon that corrupt press, which has so long been boasting of its independence and its honour. What a deal we have heard about the press being the *guardian of public morals*. What volumes have we read about its powers of correction of evil! We have, indeed, heard a part of it condemned, the *unstamped* part of it; that part of it has been pointed out as the refuse part; as the vile part: as the part which required laws to restrain it, to shackle it, to cramp it, to load it, to destroy it, if possible. We have heard Honourable Members in the Honourable House, make a distinction between the *respectable* part of the press and another part, which they denominated *unrespectable*. We have heard volumes upon volumes of commendation, praise and puffery, about this respectable part of the press. We have always denominated it

infamous; we have always said that that part of it which was not absolutely in the pay of Corruption was engaged in a sham warfare quite as serviceable to Corruption as the efforts of her own hirelings; and that with perhaps a trifling exception or two, it was a mass of infamous fraud carried on under the name of impartiality; sending forth lies, endless in number, and boundless in magnitude, vomiting forth calumnies on the defenceless, and suppressing, through the means of bribes, directly or indirectly received, every fact that could tend to expose the **THING**, and to give the common people their fair chance in society. This has been the character of this infamous press ever since we have known it; but we shall presently have to show our readers, that it has now surpassed even its own infamy, and done a deed so black as to make its former infamies turn pale.

We have first to insert an article from the weekly paper the *Observer*; to which paper the public will be in great part indebted for the knowledge of the horrible affair which the article describes. We shall then offer a few observations, that may serve just for the present on the manner in which the **THING** has been

and is likely to be illustrated by the circumstances of the transaction alluded to; and then we shall lay before our readers an account of the conduct of the "respectable" and infamous part of the press, upon this occasion; naming the several papers; and making them as notorious as it is in our power to make them.

From the Observer Sunday Newspaper, July 21, 1822.

HORRIBLE OCCURRENCE—Saturday.

It is our painful and disgusting task this day to notice a charge which has been made against a *Right Reverend Bishop*, at Marlborough Street police office, at which human nature revolts. The circumstances are of such public notoriety at the west end of the town, that it would be in vain, if any delicacy were due to the party accused, to attempt to keep them from general observation. The individual to whom we allude was recently promoted to an Irish bishopric, and is nearly related to a *Peer in Parliament*. He is an elderly man, and we understand was much respected in that class of society to which he belonged. On Friday night it appears that he was detected in a back room of the *White Lion public-house*, in *St. Alban's Place*, *St. James's*, in a situation with a private in the *Foot Guards*, to which we will not more minutely allude, but which led to his instant apprehension and removal with his companion to the watch-house. There were not fewer than seven witnesses to the fact; and it would seem that the Reverend Prelate with difficulty escaped the vengeance of the populace, who, if not prevented by the peace-officers, would have sacrificed him to their indignation

on the spot. As it was, he was severely beaten. On being secured in the watch-house, he offered bail to any amount for his liberation; but this was very properly refused, and he remained locked up in the cell during the night in a state of mind which may be more easily imagined than described. Yesterday morning he was conveyed in a hackney-coach to Marlborough-street, and was soon afterwards followed by the Soldier. They were both pursued by the execrations and revilings of the crowd which had been collected on so extraordinary an occasion. Mr. DYER, the presiding Magistrate, determined on a private examination, at which Mr. ALLEY, who attended for the Bishop, was present. The witnesses were called in separately, but their testimony was in all respects consistent, and the case established was to a certain extent of the clearest nature. Mr. ALLEY, however, submitted that as the capital charge had not been borne out, his Client was entitled to bail; a proposition to which we understand Mr. DYER was obliged to accede; and the wretched offender was permitted, in the course of the day, to go at large, upon finding sureties to the amount of one thousand pounds. The soldier, not so fortunate, was committed to take his trial.—For reasons which are obvious, we decline entering more minutely into the details of this most shocking affair; but we ought in justice to a worthy prelate, whose name has unfortunately been mentioned by mistake, in connexion with the charge, to request our readers to reflect before they come to a positive determination as to the party really implicated.

When our readers have gone through this article, and have heard us declare our perfect conviction of its truth; when they have heard us say, that it is agree-

able, as far as it goes, with the inquiries which we have made, when they have further heard, that the scene of the brutal transaction was in a back room of the public-house abovementioned; that the parties had drawn down the curtains of the room, but had left a part that the curtains did not cover but that might be seen through; that a little girl (vindictress of her sex!) happening to go into the back court into which the window looked, wondering to see the curtains drawn, had the curiosity to look in, where she saw the parties engaged in a way not to be described; that the little girl (better guardian of public morals than the "respectable" part of the press) ran to the landlord, who came out with other persons with him, who were all witnesses of the fact, to that certain extent, at least, of which the *Observer* speaks; that after this, the landlord and others laudably went, dashed in the door, took the parties in the state of Achilles as far as nakedness was necessary to their intentions; that they then dragged them to the watch-house, in that very same state: when our readers have heard all this, they will naturally cry aloud, "Why is the name of this Bishop suppressed?" It is a Bishop, the arti-

cle says. It is a "venerable prelate;" it is a Right Reverend Father in God; and why, then, is his name suppressed? The *Observer* informs us that another "worthy prelate" has been named; and unfortunately named; and the *Observer* requests its readers to reflect before they come to a positive determination as to who the party is. What, are all the *Bishops*, then, to live under this imputation or suspicion? Are all the Bishops to be suspected for the sake of this wretch, as the *Observer* itself justly calls him? This would be injustice towards the Bishops in general, equal to that which the most "respectable" and most infamous part of the press has been guilty of towards the public this day. We shall act no such part as this. We shall do our duty. And we here inform our readers: without anticipating the decisions of courts of justice; without pretending to know whether the alleged crime can be proved or not; without pretending to anticipate any thing of this sort, we inform our readers of that which they all ought to know, that the person, who was taken from the White Lion public-house above-mentioned to the watch-house, and who was afterwards taken from the watch-house

to Marlborough-street, and who was held to bail as above-mentioned; we here inform our readers that that person who was so taken along with the soldier of the guards was the *Honourable and Right Reverend Father in God, PERCY JOCELYN, Lord Bishop of Clogher* (lately translated to that Bishopric from the Bishopric of Ferns), a *Commissioner of the Board of Education* ("education of the country!") and brother of the late *Earl of Roden*.

Having performed this duty, a duty due not less to the Bishops than to the public, we have further to observe, that a man was tried in Ireland, no great while ago, on the charge of having threatened this Bishop to accuse him of such a crime; and, our readers will hear with shudderings of horror, that this man was *condemned to death*, and, of course, upon the oath of this Bishop! We believe the man was respited and transported. Upon this we shall make no further observations for the present. Our readers will need no observations from us, indeed, to convince them how well things like this are calculated to excite the "envy of surrounding nations and the admiration of the world!"

To return to the article in the *Observer*, we are somewhat sur-

prised, if it be true, that Mr. DYER should have "*found himself obliged*," and so quickly, too, and without any remanding, to let the prisoner loose upon bail; and the public will not fail to observe, and to reflect a little upon the amount of this bail of a thousand pounds, *in such a case*, and relating to such a party. The public will recollect the bail, the sureties to which Mr. CARLILE is sentenced, and compare that case with this. A thousand pounds, not, probably, a tenth part of one year's produce of his Bishopric. The *Observer* may be in error about this. The fact has not been officially announced. If all the other facts stated by the *Observer* be true, what is the sum of a thousand pounds! How is that to hold such a person to stand trial! What *sureties* are there in a thousand pounds in such a case! Whether he ever take his trial or not; the THING will take its trial before the English people; and on that trial the Thing is now put.

The *Observer* tells us, that the *Soldier* was not so fortunate. *He could not get bail!* and was COMMITTED TO TAKE HIS TRIAL! Well said, THING! It was very hard that those who bailed the Bishop would not bail the soldier. The Bishop himself

H

might have been bail for him. His Bishopric of Clogher was sufficient surety for a whole battalion. Very hard, indeed, that he was not to be bailed too! But, there will be time enough to talk about this. The main thing is for us to keep a sharp look out, and to see how the **THING**; to see how the "Education of the country;" how the "envy of surrounding nations and admiration of the "world" will work this matter!

In the meanwhile, let us look at the conduct of the respectable and infamous part of the press of this day, just looking back in one instance to yesterday. Our readers will observe, that the article which we have quoted was in the *Observer* of yesterday, consequently the thing was known to the editors of all the *Morning* papers. If such a thing had taken place between two labourers, mechanics, or tradesmen, how it would have been blazoned about through the *Morning Papers* of this day! What a cry would have been set up by these "respectable" and infamous guardians of the public morals! But, now, what has been their conduct? The *Morning Post*, the *British Press*, the *Morning Herald* and the *Morning Advertiser* have given a part and a part only of what they found in

the *Observer*. The *Morning Herald* and the *British Press* gave nearly the words of the *Observer*; but insert the article in as obscure a manner as possible. The *Morning Post* curtails the article of the *Observer* to about a fifth part, and puts it at the bottom of a column, in a part of the paper likely to escape observation. The *Morning Advertiser* curtails the article still further. Bestows no expression of horror upon the deed, and merely says "that a person of "consideration and a soldier were "taken to the office charged with "a gross misdemeanor." We now come to the *Morning Chronicle* which fills four columns of its paper with Mr. HUME's nonsensical resolutions about the National Debt and the operations of the Sinking Fund; but which can spare only just seven lines put in the very obscurest part of all of the paper, to say that "two persons" (and not a word about a Bishop!) were discovered in a public house and so forth. But we will take the very words of the *Chronicle*. They will not fill up much space; and they will enable the public to judge of the real character of this paper.

"A Sunday Paper states that "on Friday night, two persons were "discovered at a public-house in "St. James's market, in a situa-

"tion which left no doubt respecting the nature of their crime, that they were taken to the watch-house, and brought to a Police-office on Saturday morning, when it appeared from papers in the pocket of the one, that he filled a high situation, which we will not name.—The Magistrate is said to have admitted them to bail."

"Two persons!" And the *Chronicle* could find out nothing but two persons; though it had read the *Observer* as well as we, and though it would not take us much to prove that the *Chronicle* must have heard all about the matter on *Saturday night*, seeing that an Evening paper in the neighbourhood had the intelligence actually composed and going to the press on *Saturday afternoon*, and had stopped the press to cancel the matter! From what motive this cancelling took place, let the indignant public judge. The *Chronicle*, had this been an affair between two persons in common life, would have rung such a peal upon the subject as would not soon have been forgotten; and let our readers judge how powerful must have been the motive that could have induced it, not only to abridge the article of the *Observer*, not only to tell less than it had read in the Sunday paper; not only to cram this important matter into seven lines and hide it at

the bottom of a column; not only this, but to talk of *two persons*; not to name a Bishop or a Soldier at all; and to be guilty of the infamous injustice of imputing by implication the crime indiscriminately to all classes of Englishmen!

Let us now come to the elect of the respectable part of the press; the *John Bull*; the *New Times*; and the *OLD TIMES*. We have always told our readers that these were all of the same stamp; and now we shall see. *John Bull* is quite silent. *John* came out very late on Sunday morning. There was a rumour on float on Saturday, and we have already related, that an evening paper had actually got the matter set up; that is to say, the types composed for printing an account of the transaction, and that it was induced to stop the press, take out the article, scatter the types and put in another article in its stead, probably an article from the Vice Society or from some Bible Society! What happened to *John Bull*, we do not know, precisely; but something seems to have seized *John* all at once early on Sunday morning or in the middle of the night before. For, we sent to get *John's* paper, on Sunday morning about ten

o'clock; and the vender of the paper informed us, that it would not come out till very late because an *accident had happened to the machinery* in the office. This was the story told to those who went to buy the paper! Yes, our readers will see that *John's machinery* had been operated upon by something perfectly accidental, and yet of a very potent nature.

Now come that brace of brothers the *New and Old Times*. *Perfectly silent both!* Not one single word upon the subject. Not a single allusion to it; though the Old one has actually this day put forth *two papers*, that is to say, two whole sheets, which it *sells for one*, in pursuance of those desperate efforts which it is making to sustain itself. It has two whole papers, measuring very nearly two feet square; containing sixteen square feet of print, one and a half square feet of which consists of an advertisement of the Irish Subscription; it contains all this space; and in the whole of this sixteen feet square of print, room was not to be found for the insertion of one single word about the Bishop and the Soldier! Not a single allusion. Nothing that could let its readers suppose that such a thing had taken place. The cause of this need not be

stated to our readers. They will all see the cause at once; and they will all despise the man that they shall in future see with one of these papers in his hand. We would here, if we had time, refer to the statement of Dr. O'MEARA, or, rather, to what the *Times* has said about the bribe of three thousand pounds, the evidence of which BUONAPARTE found amongst the papers of the run-away BOURBON. We must leave that to be noticed another time; and, in the meanwhile, request our readers to pay attention to the facts which we have now stated; to look at the conduct of all these papers; to contrast that conduct with that which they showed in the case of the Vere-street Gang; to compare their present conduct; their present silence, with the unsparing, and just and laudable abhorrence which they then expressed; we request our readers to make this comparison, at the same time that they make a comparison between the rank and riches of the party now offending, and the obscurity and comparative poverty of the parties then offending; we request them to do this, and we are sure they will exclaim with us, that this "respectable part of the press" is surely the most infamous thing that ever

existed in any country in the world.

We must quit the subject for the present; but not without assuring our readers, that, strong as Corruption is, great as are her powers of smothering and stifling, she will not have it in her power to stifle the truth in this case. We care not how the **THING** acts. Let the **THING** do what it pleases; and let the public watch it; never forgetting the sentences on JOSEPH SWANN, Mr. CARLILE, his wife and sister. We have said before, and we repeat it, that the **THING** is now fairly on its trial. In former cases, there may have been doubts and difficulties in the way; there may have been that which blinded and deluded honest and well-meaning people; but here the matter lies in a nut-shell. Here the question is too plain to admit of being obscured and too monstrous to admit of palliation. The time cannot be distant when the decision shall take place; and in the mean time we beseech our readers to keep watch; to look sharp after the movements of the **THING**, and see what it will do. Thus we close our remarks for the present, leaving the public, to congratulate itself on the existence of one newspaper that cannot be *hushed* into silence.

We cannot dismiss this article without observing, that it is with great and unfeigned *sorrow* that we have to record this degradation of rank and dignity; but the way to uphold rank and dignity is not to be guilty of such base partiality as that which we have noticed; and the best way is to single out, as we have done, the guilty, and leave it to be supposed that it forms an exception to the mass.

Wednesday.

WE requested our readers to *watch* the **THING**, and to see how it would work this matter. The *Old Times* remained *silent* yesterday again, and we have not seen the BOURBON Print to-day; that print which *justified the massacre of the Protestants at Nismes*, and which says, that when NAPOLEON talks of finding, in the runaway BOURBONS' papers, an account of the *three thousand pounds*, given to an English newspaper, he *must mean The Times*, and that all of us *must know* that it is a *lie*! We have not seen that crazy, sinking Old Thing to-day; but, yesterday and the day before it was *silent*, silent as the grave, the *cause* of which silence every man in London knows full well.

Just, however, as if this Old battered Print could, by its silence, smother the matter. This Print was not thus silent in 1810; nor was it silent on the score of that gallant Irishman, poor CASHMAN, the part it took with regard to whom no just man in England will ever forget. It is possible, indeed, that the *Old Times* may have been a little *bothered* just at this time by the *accident*, of which we gave (in the words of the *Morning Chronicle*) an account yesterday; namely, the *rencontre* between JOHN WALTER and Doctor O'MEARA; or, rather, between the Doctor's *horse-whip* and JOHN'S shoulders. HUDIBRAS gives an account of a man, a certain part of whose body was, from repeated kickings, become so skilful that it could distinguish the *sorts of leather* of which the shoe was made; and, by this time, perhaps, JOHN'S shoulders are able to tell, whether the salute came from a thong made of horse-hide or from the skin of that long-eared animal, so strongly typical of himself. If the Doctor should find his remedy ineffectual, and that a *second operation* is necessary, we would recommend a "*cow-skin*," as it is denominated in Virginia and the West Indies, which the Doctor will find the best of all in-

struments in such an inveterate case.

Since writing the above we have seen the *Morning Chronicle* of to-day, and also the *Old Times*, from which it appears, that it was not JOHN upon whom the Doctor operated; but, through mistake, it was upon a Mr. WILLIAM WALTER of Devonshire-place, who has no connexion with the *Old Times* newspaper, directly or indirectly. It has been unfortunate for this Gentleman that he bears the *name of WALTER*; but, the benefit of being able publicly to state, "that he has no connexion directly or indirectly with the *Old Times* newspaper," we deem to be so great as to be not too dearly purchased even by the Doctor's operation. If the thing be a mistake, as it certainly must be so considered, if this new statement be true, Mr. WILLIAM WALTER will not, we hope, push things to extremity with Doctor O'MEARA. Proceedings at *law* are announced by *authority*, in the *Morning Chronicle*. We would rather see the Gentleman, if he were a friend of our's, contented with an ample public apology on the part of Doctor O'MEARA, which we cannot suppose the latter at all disinclined to make, nor the former, if he be what he is represented to

be, at all disinclined to accept of. The blows inflicted, were not intended for him. There was, in fact, no offence against him; and though the honest indignation of the Doctor ought to have been tempered with more caution, we cannot help hoping that the offended party, when he has had time to cool, and to take all the circumstances into consideration, will consult his generosity, rather than his resentment, and, according to the old and good maxim, not take that ill which was not ill meant.

To return to our subject; to drop JOHN and return to the Bishop and the Soldier; the *Old Times* of to-day again is still *silent* upon the subject. The *New Times* of yesterday, conducted by WALTER's late associate, DOCTOR STODDART, ascribes the Bishop's conduct to *insanity*! Well said, Old Boy! Well said, Old Doctors' Commons! But it did not occur to you, we suppose, that the insanity must have very recently taken place or (mind the *or*, Doctor,) that the Bishop must have been insane when he was raised from the See of *Ferns* to that of *Clogher*. Only think, Doctor, what a *defender* of the Church you are, when you disguise the name of the Bishop, and when you compel

us to conclude (if we believe you), that an insane person has been bestowing benefices; selecting Ministers of the Church; ordaining Deacons and Priests; laying on of hands at Confirmations, and doing all those things, which are committed with such awful solemnity to the hands of a Prelate of the Church.

It has been said in the *Morning Chronicle* and other newspapers, that the Bishop has *left the country*, notwithstanding the *bail* to the *immense amount of a thousand pounds*! It is said that *two tradesmen* are the sureties! These two tradesmen will hardly *lose* the five hundred pounds a-piece! Oh! this is a pretty thing altogether. And where is the *Soldier*? What is become of him? We were told that no bail could be got for him, and that he was committed to take *his trial*! To take his *trial*! To be sure, he is, and the mittimus must state his offence, too, of which, doubtless, Mr. DYER, the Magistrate, has taken care. However, *we shall see* all about this. *Nous verrons*; that is to say, *we shall see*!

In the mean time, let us take another look, at the CONDUCT OF THE PRESS. We are well informed, that on *Monday night*, Sir WM. DE CRESPIGNY, in the

House of Commons spoke of this horrible affair, and said, that the public was *very much indebted to the Statesman Newspaper*. Now let that public look into all the *Morning Papers of Tuesday*; let that injured public look into those papers; and it will find this matter wholly suppressed; not a single word of it mentioned in any one of those papers, any more than if Sir WM. DE CRESPIGNY had never opened his lips! Is this dealing fairly with the public; is it dealing fairly by Sir WM. DE CRESPIGNY; is it dealing fairly by the House of Commons; is it dealing fairly by the rest of the Bishops; and is not this press a combination of men to get from the public, or from individuals, riches by the means of suppressing truth, or circulating falsehood, as best suits their purpose?

Only mind, the spirit of unanimity here! They were all of a mind. Could this have been except they had all been acted upon in the same sort of way. Here were two motives. The first precisely the same as that which had produced their previous silence; and the second, that of preventing the public from seeing their own baseness by keeping if possible the STATESMAN from its eyes. The public,

however, has in this case as in all other cases, when not deluded, been just. It has decided, that the STATESMAN has done its duty, and we desire nothing further than that commendation. We desire no praise; we have not performed our duty with pleasure, but really with a great deal of pain. We cannot but know how deep the affliction must be amongst numerous persons connected with the party; and though those persons are, in all respects, utter strangers to us, it is impossible not to feel sorrow for their affliction. But, on the other hand, are we to have no regard for public justice; for the administration of that, without the just and impartial administration of which civil society is a disgrace to mankind and a curse to all those who live in it: are we to have no regard to this; and when we hear of a thousand pounds bail, in such a case, and appertaining to such a party, are we to block up our memories; are we to think nothing at all of the case of Mr. CARLILE; of his fines, his imprisonment, his sureties for life, are we to think nothing of his wife, sent to a dungeon with a child in her arms, in that dungeon delivered of another child; are we to think nothing of the imprisonment, the fine, the

sureties upon the sister : are we to think nothing of these, all imposed without even the imputation of moral offence, and only for impugning (we will say erroneously) a system of religion, one of the persons at the head of which, was this very Bishop ! To hold our tongues in such a case would be infamous indeed ; and would make us merit to be ruled, not with rods, but with scorpions.

Thursday.

THIS subject, in its most interesting point of view, that is to say, as it throws light on matters connected with the *administration of law and justice* ; this subject, taken in this light, will be fully treated of in the *Register of next Saturday*. For essays at great length we have not room in our diurnal publication ; but we have, we trust, done our duty towards the public in this case, and particularly by dragging forth the most "respectable" and most corrupt press in this world. We cannot, however, let another day pass without taking notice of what we find in that vile old paper, *The Times* of this morning. We shall not, like Dr. O'MEARA, put *stars* instead of letters : we name the vile old thing, and call upon the

public to witness its conduct.— In another part of our paper will be found (taken from the *Morning Chronicle* of to-day) a letter addressed to Mr. BUCHE, who, it appears, is now a Judge in Ireland. The letter has not a signature to it, but the *Chronicle* is undoubtedly well satisfied as to the facts contained in that letter. We beg our readers to peruse that letter with attention ; to make, as every honest man will, the case of Mr. BYRNE their own ; to consider of the sufferings of that man ; to consider what is due to him and his family ; and then to reflect, that if the press in Ireland had then done its duty, that which we have now had to record might never have existed.

But, how must the *Morning Chronicle* lament, then, that it did not hasten to do its duty on Monday morning ! If this paper had acted the part which the *Morning Chronicle* acted, the name of the offender would not have been known unto this day ; and, as we verily believe, *never would have been known at all*. The article which had appeared in the *Observer* of the Sunday named *nobody*. That article had appeared but in one paper. The Morning papers, that noticed the thing at all, had abridged, mutilated, and disguised

that article. Two of them, that brace of true brothers, the *Old Times* and the *New Times*, sunk the thing *wholly in silence*. So that, during the Monday, operations would have been carried on effectually to prevent all exposure of the principal criminal, and on the Tuesday morning we should have seen, in every one of these Papers, articles asserting that some gross error had been committed with respect to a Right Reverend Prelate, originating in some casual misnomer, or in something or other that would have appeared plausible. And, on the Wednesday, we should have heard the same papers lamenting, with great sincerity, that one of their contemporaries, the proprietor of a Sunday paper, had been so unadvised and rash as to give heed to loose reports, having not the smallest foundation in fact, respecting certain supposed misconduct of a most learned, venerable, and Right Reverend Prelate of the Church! Bless them! On the Thursday, that is to say, to-day, we should have heard them all open in full cry, just as if the game was in view; their voices different in tone, indeed; their manner of opening different; and different the loudness of their yell; but off they would have gone in

full and unanimous cry against the profligacy of those writers who administer to the brutal passions of the "*lower orders*," by circulating hints and inuendos tending to bring into hatred and contempt their natural protectors and guardians of the *higher orders*; tending to lessen in their esteem all those whom it is their bounden duty to venerate; tending, in short, to gratify their forward dispositions by inculcating disrespect in them towards all their betters, their pastors and masters; and thereby to produce in them a disregard of the laws of God as well as of a paternal Government; and to bring them at last into a state, in which their lives would be forfeited to the outraged ordinances of their country, and their souls turned over to the Devil.

This is what we should have had on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, if the STATESMAN had not done its duty on Monday. The *Old Times*, always the worst amongst the bad, kept quite silent during Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday. It endured our thumping for these three days as quietly as a woolpack. It seems to have been wishing to rival, in this passive quality, a pair of shouldiers not very distantly con-

nected with it. At last; but not before, it has announced that *the criminal has fled from justice*. But, let us hear the old thing, and then remark a little upon what it says for itself.

An exposure of monstrous depravity has taken place within these few days, *all allusion to which we have hitherto suppressed* Mingled feelings of sorrow, humiliation, and disgust, have been in part the causes of our silence; and the respect we owe to public decency might still have induced us to persevere in our reserve, if we could have thereby checked the horrible tale in its progress to notoriety amongst all ages and both sexes, which *we fear it has already attained to*. The person accused of being the chief criminal—P. Jocelyn, *Bishop of Clogher*—has, it is affirmed, *forfeited his bail, and quitted for ever the country which his presence had polluted. Bail in such a case!* What sum could be named which the wretch would not have sacrificed? We know not whether to rejoice or grieve that he has *fled from justice*. We know not whether the trial of such a criminal for such a crime, might not have cost more in the way of corruption, than even his death by law could have paid in the way of satisfaction to good morals. It is dreadful to remember, that a poor and perhaps innocent man was sentenced to transportation from his country, on the oath of this *mitred reprobate*, for only threatening to charge him with that of which he now stands (by his flight) confessedly convicted. It is more dreadful to think how the church of God has been scandalized and disgraced.

Thus, as the public will see, the *Old Times* can speak, when

the bird has flown; which he might not have done if the Morning papers of Monday had done their duty. This Paper can now tell us that this is a mitred reprobate. It can tell us about the man that was punished on his account in Ireland. It knows, now, all about the matter, but it could say not a word about it until Thursday morning, though the principal facts were stated in the *Observer* of Sunday: and though it is perfectly notorious to every body in London that that paper is conducted in a manner not to leave the smallest doubt of the truth of those facts.

The old hack can now exclaim, too: "*bail in such a case!*" Yes, and you knew it on Sunday morning last as well as we did. If your pretended scrupulousness about *indecenty* prevented you from narrating the facts; it could not prevent, for the public has now seen that the whole case can be communicated to it with perfect fidelity, and yet without a single hint to give offence to the most fastidious delicacy; this could not have prevented you from giving a faithful account of the transaction, quite sufficient to answer all the purposes of justice and fair dealing; but if, after all, you found yourself so stupid, so wholly des-

titute of talent as not to be able to speak upon such a subject without being guilty of grossness too offensive to be endured by the public, did that prevent you from speaking of the *bail*? Hypocrisy may serve you elsewhere; but it cannot serve you here. There is nothing indelicate in the word *bail*! When you were speaking of the Vere-street Gang, who were comparatively *poor* devils, and poor devils are always your aversion; poverty is always sin enough of itself in your eyes; when you were speaking of the Vere-street Gang, you very justly, indeed, but most vehemently, and without the smallest delicacy in the world, gave narratives of the transactions; but if you be grown delicate all at once, and if that delicacy is of such a strange complexion that it blushes when you have to speak of the conduct of a Bishop, and is hardened as brass when you have to speak of what you call the seditious conduct of Mrs. CARLILE and her sister, for not tearing whom out of their houses you blamed the Government; if your delicacy be of this strange complexion, what had delicacy to do with the *bail*?—Now that the wretch has fled; now that your publications can do him no harm; now that he laughs at your

paragraphs; now you can exclaim "*bail in such a case!*" Now, that you have done all that you can do for him by your silence, now you have seen the cat jump away, and have too, seen which way public opinion jumps, and having, besides, felt, in your sale (where alone you have feeling) now you can begin to join in; and in a few days, we should not wonder to see you beginning some foul-mouthed attack upon those whom you will choose to deem guilty of suffering this escape. We beg the public to watch you, upon this occasion. You do not well know what to do, but your workings will be matter of great curiosity at any rate.

As to your concluding remark, about the disgrace brought upon the *Church of God*, it belongs to that species of blasphemous cant, for which you are so famous; but, it weighs not a feather in wiping off the disgrace of three days' silence with regard to such a transaction. The effect of this silence you have already felt, to our certain knowledge; and the further effects are to come.

If it be true that the Bishop; that the Right Reverend Father in God, the Lord Bishop of Clogher is gone out of the kingdom never to return, as asserted in this

vile old paper, which appears to know a great deal more about the matter of going away than we do: if this be true, *what is to become of the Bishopric?* Is the Bishop still to receive the immense revenues of that Bishopric which have been stated at thirteen thousand pounds a-year, and which are probably much more? Is there to be no Bishop to supply his place? Is he to have a deputy? It would be deemed blasphemous to say that Bishops are of no use; it would be deemed revolutionary and treasonable. We must not, therefore, say that; and yet it would be hard to say what use a Bishop is to be of, if he can live out of the country all his lifetime.

We know not, however, of any law, by which a man may be unbishoped, or have his revenues taken from him. We do know, however, that a law *can be made* to do it, and for the honour of the country we do hope that the Parliament will not separate without taking this matter up. We are not to be told, that the Parliament cannot interfere in *legal proceedings already commenced*. We have a case; a case in point as to every thing but the nature of the Act. Scores of clergymen of the

Church of England were informed against for non-residence in 1799. Actions were brought against them agreeably to the 21st (we think it was) of Henry VIII. Now mind, here were legal proceedings against many Clergymen of the Church.---The law was clear. There was no quirk that could save them. There was no law existing that would admit of an interpretation in their favour. Then came (pull your hats off, readers!) then came *the Parliament* and passed a law to save them by quashing the informations against them; by putting an end to those legal proceedings, and suffering the spiritual persons to go free.

Now, if this could be done by Act of Parliament; if the Parliament could interfere, and in so effectual a manner here, to set aside one of the most important provisions in that code which gave the Church its property; if it could do this, can it not interfere *now*? Or are we to be told that it can never interfere with laws relative to the Church, except for the purpose of protecting those Members of that Church, who have been guilty of a breach of the laws? However, **WE SHALL SEE**; for, as we have said from the beginning, the **THING** is now upon its trial!

JOHN WALTER
AND DR. O'MEARA.

[From the same]—Thursday.

WE have heard that the Mr. WILLIAM WALTER, whom the *Chronicle* said was so handsomely flogged by Dr. O'MEARA, is the brother of JOHN of the *Times*. The *Chronicle* told us, that it had authority to say, that this WILLIAM WALTER had nothing to do, either directly or indirectly with the *Old Times* newspaper. If this be true, we are sorry that he got the flogging, for two reasons, first, because he did not deserve it; and second, because, in all human probability, he will have kept it from the back of the man that deserved it. The *Old Times* of yesterday tells us that JOHN is 40 miles from London; but it is careful not to name the place! We dare say that if he be near the turnpike-road, he keeps a sharp look out! With a little alteration, JOHN may now say with MACBETH: "How is it with me, when the crack of every coachman and carter's whip alarms me!"---It was a little too impudent in the *Times*,

we must confess, to call the Doctor a liar, when it acknowledged, itself, that no other paper could have been meant, when a Bourbon bribe of three thousand pounds was talked of. But how the Doctor came to know that JOHN had any thing to do with the matter seems strange to us, seeing that we believe that the name of two women are down at the Stamp-office as principal proprietors of the paper. This was the case, we know, only 18 months back, and we see no reason to suppose that it is not the case now. Why then, should the Doctor fall upon poor JOHN? If we were in JOHN's place, and had JOHN's feelings about us, we would not stay banished, as it were, forty miles from London. Men may say what they will in the way of ridiculing petticoat government. JOHN finds it a very good thing, we dare say; for it gives that which many other Governments take care not to give, and do not seem to be made for at all; namely, shelter! And, if we were JOHN WALTER, we would not give it out that we were forty miles from London and sink the name of the place; we would actually and literally take shelter under the petticoats, and let the Doctor flog away if he dared, the cowardly dog!

LETTERS

OF

MR. COBBETT

*To the Committee of the Dinner
to be given to Mr. Woole at
Birmingham.*

Kensington, 20 July 1822.

GENTLEMEN,

I RECEIVED ON Thursday, your obliging invitation to the Dinner above-mentioned. I had, without any invitation, signified in the last *Register*, my intention to attend. Your invitation was followed, yesterday, by a most obliging offer, on the part of one of you, of lodging and other accommodations at Birmingham. But notwithstanding these additional inducements, and though I had notified, in a part of the *Register*, printed off early yesterday, my thankful acceptance of the honour you had done me, I found, from intelligence received by yesterday's post, that it would be impossible for me to attend on the 29th, without such inconvenience as I could not have put myself to without ascribing to my presence at the Dinner a degree of importance that it did not deserve. I regret this on my own account; for I should have had singular pleasure in being,

on such an occasion, amongst the industrious, ingenious and public-spirited artisans and mechanics of Birmingham, who have done themselves so much honour by their alacrity to show their unshaken attachment to Mr. Woole

I am, Gentlemen,

Your most obedient and

Most humble Servant,

WM. COBBETT.

Kensington, July 22, 1822.

GENTLEMEN,

TO-DAY I have a letter from you, informing me, that you had (before the arrival of my last *Register*) placarded the walls with a notice that I should attend at the Dinner to be given to Mr. Woole; that my non-attendance would occasion great disappointment; that many persons have taken Tickets, as you believe, with the impression that they should meet me; that the effervescence of expectation is so great, that you fear disadvantageous consequences from the disappointment; and that, if I do not attend, the Committee will be exposed to blame for having, in the placards, asserted, in so positive a manner, that I should attend.

As to the motives of the Committee, I, of course, can know nothing of them; but, while I

should greatly lament disappointing any of the worthy people of Birmingham, you will, I am sure, do me the justice to say, that the placarding was done without my consent or knowledge, and that you never possessed any notification from me of my intention to attend on the 29th.

I heard of the Dinner at first *by accident*; I then sent to Mr. Wooler's office to ascertain the day; I was informed that it was the 26th; I received no invitation till *last Thursday*, four days after my notification had reached Birmingham. It was, however, still my intention to attend, but, a letter by Friday's post informed me that I could not do this on the 29th, without extreme inconvenience; and, thereupon I gave up the design, my mortification at doing which being considerably diminished by perceiving, that, in your public advertisement and hand-bill, you had, in *naming* the persons invited, confined yourselves to "*Thomas Northmore, Esq. Major Cartwright, and the Rev. Henry Cresswell.*" This, at once, relieved me from all anxiety on the score of causing any of that disappointment which you appear to anticipate, and which I hope

you very much overrate, seeing that it would give me great pain to be, though blamelessly, the cause of disappointing any one single man of the public-spirited labouring classes of Birmingham, whose friendship is so highly valued by me.

Nevertheless, the notification of my intention to attend having been placarded, though without any knowledge of mine, and it being my most anxious desire to prevent whatever inconvenience may be likely to arise from the disappointment, which you (groundlessly I hope) appear to apprehend, I shall, by to-morrow's coach, send to you copies of this letter, which, in justice to me as well as to the public, I trust you will be so good as to cause to be posted up in the same way as the notification was posted.

I am, Gentlemen,
Your most obedient and
Most humble Servant,
WM. COBBETT.

BREWING.

A new edition of *Cottage Economy* is in the press, and it will contain an account of the manner of making Beer by means *other* than those of the *Brewing Machine*.—This edition will be out in ten day's time.